(4)

CF 1001

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION (S) No. 4967 /2006

PETITIONER :: NARAYAN LAL CHANDRAKAR S/O. SHRI THANU RAM CHANDRAKAR, AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS, ASSISTANT TEACHER, GOVT. PRIMARY GIRLS SCHOOL TUMGAON, R/o. SHRI RAMKRISHNA MISHRA COLLEGE ROAD, WARD NO.15, MAHASAMUND DISTRICT MAHASAMUND (C.G.).

P.R. No. 4924/06
Presented by Shri Umakant
dated 7/9/06

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :1) STATE OF CHHATTISGARH, THROUGH SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, DKS BHAVAN, RAIPUR (C.G.)

RECEIVED-COPY
7/9/06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

:2) COMMISSIONER, DEPARTMENT OF TRIBAL WELFARE, RAIPUR (C.G.)

OATH COMMISSIONER
APARNA MALVIYA
CG-2073/96
Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

:3) THE DIRECTOR, PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, RAIPUR (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

XI-HC-78

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

(39)

W.P.(S) 4967/06

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	11.9.2006 Smt. Hamida Siddique, counsel for the petitioners. Shri Satish Gupta, Deputy Govt. counsel for the State/ respondents. Heard. Perused the records. Common order dictated in open Court, passed separately. A copy of this order be placed on records. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge	

Subhash

P.T.O.

12.9.06

(81)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W. P. No. 2511/2005

Petitioner : Smt. Usha Thawre

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh & others

W. P. No. 2512/2005

Petitioner : Sarita Maseeh

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh & others

W. P. No. 4312/2006

Petitioners : Ramdev Say & another

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh & others

W. P. No. 4313/2006

Petitioners : Notan Kumar Garg & another

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh & others

And

W.P.(S) No. 4967/2006

Petitioner : Narayan Lal Chandrakar

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh & others

SB: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Satish K. Agnihotri, J

Smt. Hamida Siddique, counsel for the petitioners.

Shri Satish Gupta, Deputy Govt. counsel for the State/ respondents.

ORDER

(11th September, 2006)

The following order of the Court is passed by **Satish K. Agnihotri, J.**

1. By this petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India the petitioners seek a direction to the respondents to pay the increments and seniority on the basis of the date of their initial appointments in the light of the decision rendered by the learned State Administrative Tribunal, Jabalpur in O.A. No. 1452/98 (Harish Chand Singh & others Vs. State of M.P. & others) dated 31.1.2000, O.A.No. 802/98 (Akhilesh Mishra & others Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh & others) and O.A.No. 991/98 (Ramayan Prasad Dwivedi & others Vs. State of M.P. & others).

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners placed on record a copy of the order dated 23.3.2006 passed by this Court in Writ Petition No. 2577/2003 (NemSingh Thakur and others Vs. State of Chhattisgarh & others) and submits that the petitioners are similarly situated, therefore the similar order may be passed.

3. The present writ petitions, being Writ Petitions No. 2511/2005, 2512/2005, 4312/2006, 4313/2006 and W.P.(S) No. 4967/2006 involve common identical facts and common question of law. Thus, these petitions are being disposed of by this common order.

4. The cases of the petitioners are that they were appointed as Upper Division Teachers in the School Education Department on probation for a period of two years with the fixed salary. However, later on after completion of two years tenure the petitioners were regularized

(85)

but they were not being given the regular pay scale. Other similarly situated teachers moved the State Administrative Tribunal, Jabalpur for regular pay scale, wherein learned Tribunal vide order dated 31.1.2000 allowed the same. The petitioners made several representations to accord the same treatment as they are also similarly situated Upper Division Teachers but the respondents have not paid any heed, therefore they are forced to file this petition.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners may be allowed to make a representation to the Respondent No. 1 to give similar treatment to the petitioners and the same pay scale which have been sanctioned to other similarly situated teachers on account of the order of the State Administrative Tribunal dated 31.1.2000, to which learned State counsel has no objection.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, in the opinion of this Court the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners appears to be reasonable. Therefore, the petitioners are allowed to make a representation within a period of two weeks from today to the respondent No. 1, raising all their grievances and in turn the Respondent No.1 shall decide the said representation in an objective manner within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of such representation, after considering all the points raised by the petitioners and taking into account the order dated 31.1.2000 passed by the learned State Administrative Tribunal in O.A. No. 1452/98, and if the petitioners stand on the same footings, as the petitioners in the

O.A. No. 1452/98 then they be also sanctioned the same pay scale and seniority.

7. These writ petitions are accordingly disposed of with the aforesaid direction. No order as to costs.

8. A copy of this order be placed in the record of other four connected writ petitions.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Subhash